



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,904	10/01/2001	Kiyoshi Sawada	19036/37471	1218
4743	7590	02/12/2004		
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 6300 SEARS TOWER 233 S. WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER HYLTON, ROBIN ANNETTE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3727	8

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/857,904

Applicant(s)

SAWADA ET AL.

Examiner

Robin A. Hylton

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because several figures have two separate figures therein. For instance, figure 1 has (A) and (B). Each figure must be numbered and labeled separately such as Figure 1A and Figure 1B. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Figures 12A, 12B and 13 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated as denoted by "conventional lid member" at page 1 and in the brief description of the drawings on page 11. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not a single paragraph and appears to exceed the 150 word limit. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The title should include at least one technical, or inventive, feature of the claimed instant invention.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the figures are not indicated separately as figure 1A and figure 1B and grammatical errors such as "approximate values each other", "register mutual position" and "figure of the lid member" in paragraph 2 on page 3.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3727

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claims 13,14,17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the claims are rejected for the following reasons:

It is unclear if "in solid form" refers to continuous or if the lubricant is solid and non-liquid.

Claims 13,14, and 18 each recite the limitation "the circumferential edge". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

The structure of claim 17 is unclear since varnish is set forth as being between an easily-peelable portion of the surface sheet and the surface sheet. How is it between a portion of the sheet and the sheet itself?

Dependent claims not specifically mentioned are rejected as depending from rejected base claims since they inherently contain the same deficiencies therein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-16,18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyoshi (JP 60-9171) in view of Elias (US 4,209,126) and Shiraishi (JP 8-305291).

Miyoshi teaches the claimed lid except for a second slit separating an easily-peelable portion and a non-peelable portion of a surface sheet 11, a lubricant between the surface sheet

Art Unit: 3727

and a composite sheet at the easily-peelable portion, and specific material and dimensions of the lubrication area.

Elias teaches it is known to provide a slit forming a boundary between an easily-peelable portion and a non-peelable portion of a surface sheet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of a slit forming a boundary between an easily-peelable portion and a non-peelable portion of a surface sheet of Miyoshi. Doing so allows for complete separation of the easily-peelable portion from the rest of the lid upon opening.

Shiraishi teaches it is known to use a lubricant between two sheets to allow easy separation between the sheets.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further apply the teaching of a lubricant to the lid of Miyoshi. Doing so allows for separation of one portion of the surface sheet without the need for different strength adhesives.

Regarding the dimensions and shape of the openings and/or slits and the specific materials of the lubricant, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select any size and material expedient for manufacturing the lid and for ease of use.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 17 appears to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Various peelable lids are cited for their disclosures.

Art Unit: 3727

11. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703) 872-9306. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3720 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

12. It is called to applicant's attention that if a communication is faxed before the reply time has expired, applicant may submit the reply with a "Certificate of Facsimile" which merely asserts that the reply is being faxed on a given date. So faxed, before the period for reply has expired, the reply may be considered timely. A suggested format for a certificate follows:

I hereby certify that this correspondence for Application Serial No. _____ is being facsimiled to The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via fax number (703) 872-7306 on the date shown below:

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate

Signature_____

Date_____


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robin Hylton whose telephone number is (703) 308-1208. The examiner works a flexible schedule, but can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee Young, can be reached on (703) 308-2572.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g., copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Errica Bemby at (703) 306-4005.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

RAH
February 9, 2004


Robin A. Hylton
Primary Examiner
GAU 3727